

The production model of Ishida *et al.* and unitarity

M.R. Pennington

Centre for Particle Theory, University of Durham,
Durham DH1 3LE, U.K.

ABSTRACT

The relation between scattering and production amplitudes imposed by unitarity and analyticity, recently criticised by Ishida *et al.* ^{1),2)}, is explained.

In a contribution to the Seventh International Conference on Hadron Spectroscopy at Brookhaven, Ishida *et al.* ^{1),2)} have questioned one of the orthodox methods of implementing the final state interaction theorem in production processes. Here we show that this criticism is incorrect, being based on a misunderstanding of the method. The case considered by Ishida *et al.* ^{1),2),3)} is particularly simple, it is that of a single channel, for instance $\pi\pi \rightarrow \pi\pi$. It is then well-known that each unitary partial wave amplitude can, for real s — the square of the c.m. energy, be represented by

$$\mathcal{T}(s) = \frac{K(s)}{1 - i\rho(s)K(s)} \quad , \quad (1)$$

where $\rho(s)$ is the standard phase-space factor of $2p/\sqrt{s}$ (p being the c.m. 3-momentum) and $K(s)$ is real. Importantly, $K(s)$ embodies any real zeros of the amplitude $\mathcal{T}(s)$.

Now Watson's final state interaction theorem ⁴⁾ requires that any other (non-strongly interacting) process producing the same final state must have its corresponding partial wave $\mathcal{F}(s)$ having the same phase. To implement this within the K -matrix formalism, Aitchison ⁵⁾ proposed representing $\mathcal{F}(s)$ by

$$\mathcal{F}(s) = \frac{P(s)}{1 - i\rho(s)K(s)} \quad , \quad (2)$$

where the function $P(s)$, like $K(s)$, is real for real values of s . The complex denominator,

$1 - i\rho K$, not only ensures the production amplitude has the same phase as the elastic one, Eq. (1) for s real, but also ensures that physical states, which are poles in the complex s -plane on the nearby unphysical sheets, transmit from one process to another through this universal denominator.

It is common practice to parameterise the K -matrix in terms of poles. However, these introduce artificial zeros, Eq. (2), in the production amplitude, unless the function $P(s)$ has the very same poles. A simple method of implementing this constraint has been proposed by AMP ⁶⁾. This is to express the P -vector as

$$P(s) = \alpha(s) \hat{K}(s) \quad , \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{K}$ is the reduced K -matrix, which contains the poles of $K(s)$, but with its zeros divided out. In this simple representation

$$\mathcal{F}(s) = \alpha(s) \hat{T}(s) \quad (4)$$

with $\hat{T}(s)$ being the T -matrix with its zeros removed ⁶⁾. In general, then analyticity requires $\alpha(s)$ to be a *smooth* function for $s > s_{threshold}$ ^{6),7)}. In physical $\pi\pi$ scattering, the only such zeros to divide out are the Adler zeros below threshold for the S -waves and the kinematic zeros at threshold for higher partial waves. Such zeros are divided out, since zeros of the amplitudes $\mathcal{T}(s)$ will not, in general, transmit to production amplitudes, $\mathcal{F}(s)$, though of course poles do.

Ishida *et al.* ²⁾ construct a simple one-channel model in which the K -matrix has two poles, so that

$$K(s) = \frac{g_1^2}{s - m_1^2} + \frac{g_2^2}{s - m_2^2} \quad . \quad (5)$$

Clearly, this example has a zero at $s = s_0$ between $s = m_1^2$ and $s = m_2^2$, where

$$s_0 = (g_1^2 m_2^2 + g_2^2 m_1^2) / (g_1^2 + g_2^2) \quad . \quad (6)$$

This zero in $\mathcal{T}$ will not, in general, occur in production processes. Hence, it is necessary to define a reduced $\hat{\mathcal{T}}$ or equivalently $\hat{K}$ -matrix. Then any production process can be

expressed as

$$\mathcal{F}(s) = \alpha(s) \frac{\hat{K}(s)}{1 - i\rho(s)K(s)} \quad , \quad (7)$$

where

$$\hat{K}(s) = \frac{(g_1^2 + g_2^2)}{(s - m_1^2)(s - m_2^2)} \quad (8)$$

and $\alpha(s)$ having only a left hand cut is expected to be a smooth function for $s > s_{threshold}$. If the reduced $\hat{K}$ -matrix is not used, but instead K itself, as in the example of Ishida *et al.* ²⁾, a spurious zero transmits to the production process, unphysically shackling its description.

This discussion is readily generalised to n coupled channels, when $\mathcal{T}$ and K are $n \times n$ matrices and $\mathcal{F}$ and α are n -component vectors. However, when there is only one channel, the reason for introducing the reduced $\hat{K}$ -matrix is particularly transparent. The hadronic amplitude $\mathcal{T}$ can be written in terms of the phase-shift δ as

$$\mathcal{T}(s) = \frac{1}{\rho} \sin \delta e^{i\delta} \quad . \quad (9)$$

The K -matrix element is then $\tan \delta / \rho$. Clearly, the K -matrix has poles when $\delta = (2n + 1)\pi/2$ (with $n = 1, 2, \dots$) and the amplitude $\mathcal{T}$ has zeros when $\delta = n\pi$ (again with n an integer). In terms of the phase-shift, the production amplitude $\mathcal{F}$ of Eq. (2) becomes

$$\mathcal{F}(s) = \frac{1}{\rho} P \cos \delta e^{i\delta} \quad . \quad (10)$$

It is then obvious that unless $P(s)$ has the poles of the K -matrix, $\mathcal{F}(s)$ will be zero exactly where resonances are expected to show up, *i.e.* when $\delta = (2n + 1)\pi/2$ making $\cos \delta = 0$. Choosing $P(s)$ to be simply proportional to $K(s)$ replaces $\cos \delta$ in Eq. (10) by $\sin \delta$. However, then the zeros of $\mathcal{T}$, Eq. (9), at $\delta = n\pi$, unnecessarily transmit to the production amplitude. Thus these zeros must be removed by defining the reduced K -matrix, $\hat{K}$, as

$$\hat{K}(s) = K(s) / \prod_n (s - s_n) \quad , \quad (11)$$

where $\delta(s_n) = n\pi$, so that Eq. (7) follows. Then Eq. (3) relates $P(s)$ to $\alpha(s)$, where analyticity requires $\alpha(s)$ to be smooth.

In the example of Ishida *et al.*, the phase-shift $\delta = \pi$ at $s = s_0$ of Eq. (6) and it is essential that this zero is divided out before constructing the production amplitude, as in Eqs. (7,8). In the case of physical $\pi\pi$ scattering, inelasticity has set in before any phase-shift reaches π , consequently this example has no relevance beyond this model of Ishida *et al.*. However, for physical $\pi\pi$ scattering the determinant of the T -matrix does vanish close to $K\overline{K}$ threshold and defining a reduced $\hat{K}$ -matrix eliminates this zero. This is the multi-channel generalization of the above example discussed in Ref. 7.

References

1. M.Y. Ishida, S. Ishida and T. Ishida, *Relation between scattering and production amplitudes — case of intermediate σ -particle in $\pi\pi$ system*, contribution to Hadron'97, Brookhaven, August 1997.
2. T. Ishida, K. Takamatsu, T. Tsuru, M.Y. Ishida and S. Ishida, *σ -particle in production processes*, contribution to Hadron'97, Brookhaven, August 1997.
3. S. Ishida, M.Y. Ishida, H. Takahashi, T. Ishida, K. Takamatsu and T. Tsuru, Prog. Theor. Phys. **95** (1996), 745.
4. K.M. Watson, Phys. Rev. **88** (1952), 1163.
5. I.J.R. Aitchison, Nucl. Phys. **A189** (1972), 417.
6. K.L. Au, D. Morgan and M.R. Pennington, Phys. Rev. **D35** (1987), 1633.
7. D. Morgan and M.R. Pennington, Z. Phys. **C48** (1990), 623.